



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

innocently eulogized in this delicious fashion: “. . . it was a generous act on the part of the Nubian conqueror to spare him such a terrible humiliation in the sight of his former allies . . .” (IV. 114).

The question of transliteration, being exclusively philological, cannot be treated in this REVIEW, but the general observation should certainly be made that the old misreadings scattered through this work are very numerous, besides many of the author's own making, like the absurd miswriting of the name of Amenhotep IV. both in hieroglyphic and transliteration (IV. 118). But the reader can best judge of these if he notes that the Tanite king, known to the Greeks as Smendes, appears in this work as “Nes-ba-Tetet,” “Nes-ba-neb-Tet,” “Ba-neb-Tet,” and “Nes-ba-Tet” (VI. 1, 4, 7); and the Egyptian name of Cambyses is now “Ra-mesuth” and again “Mesthu-Ra” (VII. 42, 45); although there is but one correct form for each of these two names.

The English of the work, like the method employed, is loose. I cannot forbear quoting a remarkable passage regarding the inscription set up at the southern boundary of Egypt by Userthesen III.: “It prohibited every negro from passing that spot, whether by sailing down the river or marching along its banks, as well as the passage of all oxen and sheep and goats and asses, except such as were engaged in the traffic in cattle, and such as had need to come to Egypt for the purposes of barter and of business generally” (III. 36-37).

The work is very fully illustrated, presenting many unpublished monuments, some of them of great importance. For the publication of this material every student of Egyptian civilization will be grateful to the author. The monuments of the earliest dynastic as well as of the predynastic period from the rich collections of the British Museum, thus made accessible to the public, are especially valuable. The statue of Apet (II. 5), dated by the author in the archaic period, is a forgery and was made for one of the mudirs of Upper Egypt.

While severe strictures upon the author's method have been necessary, there are respects in which the work will prove very useful. The account of the successive excavations which have brought us our knowledge of the earliest dynasties; the attempt to furnish a complete list of all known royal names; the insertion of Moslem sources on the former state of the monuments; and the full citation of classic sources, where a proper translation has been employed, all these will be very convenient for ready reference. It is much to be regretted that the service rendered by the author in these particulars should be obscured by the defects to which so much attention has so unavoidably been given above. Finally it should be added that the typography of the volumes is good and that misprints are rare.

The House of Seleucus. By EDWYN ROBERT BEVAN, M.A. (London: Edward Arnold; New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1902. Two vols. Pp. xii, 330; viii, 333.)

OF making many Greek histories — *in usum scholarum* — there is no end. The beaten track is become a very boulevard from the Plain of Troy

to the field of Chæronea ; and then — the jungle. Now and then we have the story of greater Greece from the hand of a master like Grote ; but the historian of Athenian democracy had no heart for the plunge from the city-state to the world-empire. He had no use for “that non-Hellenic conqueror,” “who, though not a Greek, had become the master of all Greeks” ; and it is but coldly and under protest that he follows him and his spurious Hellenism into Asia and drops anchor for good and all in “that gulf of Grecian nullity which marks the succeeding century.” Among English historians of Greece only Thirlwall, whom nobody now reads, has taken the larger and juster view of his subject ; and, if the modern student is coming to see that it was not all over with Greece when Demosthenes ended his own life at Calauria, it is mainly due not to the formal histories, but to Mahaffy’s suggestive and discursive studies. While these do not constitute, they may at least inspire a definitive history of Hellenism — not in the narrow sense nor within the narrow limits of Droysen, but a fresh and exhaustive survey of the whole wide field of Grote, Droysen, Mommsen, and Finlay.

In our own time archæology has been writing new and brilliant chapters for the very opening of such a history — at Troy and Mycenæ and Knossos ; and now the explorer is pushing into the more forbidding jungles of the east. With his second volume Niese has brought his *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten* down to the death of Antiochus III. (187 B. C.), and Kaerst’s first volume (*Geschichte des hellenistischen Zeitalters*) covers the life of Alexander ; while Adolf Holm’s fourth volume undertakes “to describe for the first time the whole course of Greek life and thought in Europe and beyond the Mediterranean, from the death of Alexander down to the battle of Actium.” And now comes Mr. Bevan on a line of his own — that of segregating the youngest of the Diadochi and following the fortunes of his house to the finish. In his own words, he “sets out to illuminate . . . the work accomplished by the dynasty of Seleucus in its stormy transit of the world’s stage two thousand years ago.” It is no fault of the illuminator if the light sometimes fails and oftentimes barely serves to make the darkness visible ; and he has certainly economized the last ray that could be wrung from the sources within reach. To a mere annalist the case would be desperate, but that is not Mr. Bevan’s quality ; to him, as to us, the house of Seleucus is chiefly important not in its external fortunes, but because it was under its ægis that Hellenism struck roots in all lands from the Mediterranean to the Pamir.

It is indeed an illuminating as well as a noble chapter on “Hellenism in the East” with which our author begins his work. Hellenism was the product of the Greek city-state, whose achievement it was to bring freedom and civilization into union ; it implied a certain type of character — that of the free man dominated by duty to the state — and it implied a certain cast of ideas, for this duty-bound freeman lived in an atmosphere of debate and habitually referred all things to the standard of reason and reality. Yet a great part of Hellenism, once developed,—

the body of ideas, of literary and artistic tastes — was communicable to men who had not themselves lived under those conditions. Before the end of the fourth century it had leavened Macedonia and followed Alexander's flag to the ends of the earth; and long after the conqueror's death the ruling powers from the Balkans to the Indus continued to be Greek in speech and mind. Then Rome, the real successor of Alexander, having itself taken all the mental and artistic culture it possesses from the Greeks, steps in to maintain the supremacy of Greek civilization in the east. Hellenism, however, had still to pay the price. The law of ancient history was inexorable: a large state must be a monarchic state. Rome in becoming a world-power became a monarchy. Thus, thanks to despotic kings — first Macedonian, and then Roman — Hellenism is carried far beyond its original borders: the vessel is broken and the long-secreted elixir is poured out for the nations. And the old leaven is still working. "What we call the Western spirit in our own day is really Hellenism incarnate. . . . All through the chaos the seeds of the old culture were carefully nursed. . . . Men at the Renaissance took up the thoughts of the Greeks again where they had dropped them." "The civilization which perished from India with the extinction of the Greek kings has come back again in the person of the British official." But "Hellenism has as yet had very little time to show — what it can do" — say, in Manchuria!

We have tried to summarize this chapter because it gives the author's key-note; and, for a translator of *Æschylus*, his point of view is sufficiently modern. The second chapter, on the "Physical Environment," in a way recalls Ernst Curtius, as does the painstaking topography of the whole work; yet we miss Curtius's vivid autopsy. Following these general chapters, the author proceeds to narrate "the series of events that led up to the virtual conquest of the whole heritage of Alexander by Seleucus" (Chaps. III.–VI.); next he traces the history of his successors down to the assassination of Seleucus III., in so far as that history is concerned with Asia Minor (Chaps. VII.–X.); and then takes each of the other provinces — Syria, Babylonia, Iran, India — in turn to see what can be gleaned of its life under these Hellenistic kings (Chaps. XI.–XIV.). The plan is hardly an ideal one, though we cannot quarrel with Mr. Bevan for not constructing an orderly history out of the scraps at his command; but one may wonder that, having picked up the dropped stitches, he does not seize the moment of Seleucus's fate — leaving his empire apparently in the throes of dissolution — to bring his first volume to a close, instead of running on a chapter on the "First Years of Antiochus III."

Thus the second volume would gain a completeness and unity impossible in the first. There is the long reign of Antiochus the Great — twenty years of incessant fighting that wins back well-nigh all that his father and grandfather had lost, until Rome takes a hand, and a decade later the hundred years' struggle of the house of Seleucus for Asia Minor ends with the practical annihilation of the king's army by Scipio at

Magnesia (190 B. C.) ; and the empire, which had almost been the empire of Alexander, shrinks to a kingdom of Syria (Chaps. XV.—XXI.). Henceforth, the plot has but a single thread, and that is cut short when Pompey appears as conqueror in Syria to settle its affairs in the name of Rome, and the kingdom of the house of Seleucus is come to an utter end (64 B. C.). But not the house ; the kings of Commagene boasted its blood, and one of them — without a throne but still calling himself king, though he had been a Roman consul and was then an Athenian citizen, enrolled in the deme of Besa — set up at Athens as late as 115 A.D. the well-known monument of Philopappos.

Reckoning from “the year of the Greeks” (312 B. C.) — when young Seleucus, whom we have seen slipping out of Babylon four years earlier and riding for his life with fifty horsemen to Egypt, routs Demetrius at Gaza and reestablishes himself as master in the house of Nebuchadnezzar — until Philip II., and with him the house of Seleucus, finally disappears (56 B. C.), the era of the Seleucids comprises more than a quarter-millennium, and the fortunes of the house touch every height and every depth. Here is room and verge for the historian ; and, withal, temptation to let fancy range where fact is not forthcoming. But Mr. Bevan is no romancer : he frankly tells us when the light goes out, and yet from point to point he holds fast his clue. Thus to illustrate at once his frankness and his force :

For us a great cloud comes down upon the contest. History has mainly forgotten it. We can only see dim glints of armies that sweep over Western Asia, and are conscious of an imbroglio of involved wars. But we can understand the stupendous nature of that task which the house of Seleucus set itself to do — to hold together under one scepter against all the forces which battered it, forces stronger than any by which the Achæmenian Empire had ever been assailed till the coming of Alexander, against all the elements of disruption which sapped it within, the huge fabric built up by Seleucus Nicator. It was a labour of Sisyphus. The Empire, a magnificent *tour de force*, had no natural vitality. Its history from the moment it misses the founder’s hand is one of decline. It was a “sick man” from its birth. Its construction occupied the few glorious years of Seleucus Nicator, its dissolution the succeeding two and a quarter centuries. Partially restored again and again, it lapses almost immediately into new ruin. The restorations become less and less complete. But it does a great work in propagating and defending Hellenism in the East till the advent of Rome (I. 75ff.).

While candor and sobriety are the chief notes, and the resultant sketchiness and inequality of treatment make but dry reading, these pages are brightened by many a sunburst — as when our author tells over again Polybius’s story of the betrayal of Achæus (which General Funston’s biographer should not fail to read) ; or Demetrius’s escape from Rome, after the same first-hand authority ; or Antiochus’s benevolent assimilation of the Jews — “the little people” who had hitherto “dwelt separate in their hill country and, while wars rolled past them and king-

doms clashed and changed, nursed the sacred fire and meditated on the Law of the Lord."

In the present state of knowledge, with literary sources mainly at second-hand and scrappy, while over most of the territory in question where the monumental sources lie buried the archæologist has not yet broken ground, no definitive history can be written; but Mr. Bevan has done good work in this fore-study of what must ultimately take its place as a notable chapter in the great history of Hellenism. Should the book ever come to a second edition, which is hardly probable, it would be the better for two or three "helps": first, a chronological table like that prefixed to Mahaffy's *Greek Life and Thought*; second, side-notes such as make Grote's *History* and many subsequent works doubly useful and usable; and third, some such digest and critique of authorities as Holm appends to his chapters. The three maps are fair and the plates excellent, presenting a fine series of Seleucid portrait-heads on forty-six coin types.

J. IRVING MANATT.

Augustus: The Life and Times of the Founder of the Roman Empire.

By E. S. SHUCKBURGH. (London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1903. Pp. x, 318.)

Augustus Cæsar and the Organisation of the Empire of Rome. By JOHN B. FIRTH. [Heroes of the Nations.] (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1903. Pp. xvi, 371.)

"AUGUSTUS," says Shuckburgh, "has been much less attractive to biographers than Julius; perhaps because the soldier is more interesting than the statesman; perhaps because the note of genius conspicuous in the Uncle was wanting in the Nephew." Firth, after remarking that to his knowledge no biography of Augustus had yet appeared in English, suggests that "the reason of this apparent neglect may be found in the circumstance that his character is one of the most puzzling in antiquity. The Emperor Julian compared him to a chameleon; Augustus himself signed his State papers with a ring bearing the device of a Sphinx. Both the man and his work remain 'a contradiction still'; theory and practice in his case persistently refuse to be reconciled; one can hardly feel quite sure at any given point in Augustus's life that one knows exactly what he had in mind." Perhaps a still better reason is that the biographer finds extremely little to add to the historian. Firth and Shuckburgh enter a field which has already been well cultivated; historians like Merivale, Schiller, Herzog, and Duruy, whose works include the reign of Augustus, have dealt creditably with the subject, and each in his own way has solved, or attempted to solve, the sphinx-riddle. In approaching these two recent biographies, therefore, we may look for little that is new; but we shall not be disappointed in expecting to find the old material put into a fresher and more convenient form.

The compass of the two works is nearly the same, Shuckburgh treating the subject with somewhat greater detail. After devoting a few pages